

Efficient entanglement distillation for quantum communication network with atomic-ensemble memories

Tao Li¹, Guo-Jian Yang¹, and Fu-Guo Deng^{1,2,*}

¹*Department of Physics, Applied Optics Beijing Area Major Laboratory,
Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China*

²*State key Laboratory of Networking and Switching Technology,
Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing 100876, China*

(Dated: March 20, 2014)

Atomic ensembles are perfect memory nodes for long-distance quantum communication network due to the long coherence time and the collective enhancement effect for nonlinear interaction between an ensemble and a photon. Here we investigate the possibility of achieving the entanglement distillation for nonlocal atomic ensembles by the input-output process of a single photon as a result of cavity quantum electrodynamics. We give an optimal entanglement concentration protocol (ECP) for two-atomic-ensemble systems in a partially entangled pure state with known parameters and an efficient ECP for the systems in an unknown partially entangled pure state with a nondestructive parity-check detector (PCD) which is constructed in an efficient way. For the two-atomic-ensemble systems in a mixed entangled state, we introduce an entanglement purification protocol with PCDs. These entanglement distillation protocols have high fidelity and efficiency with current experimental techniques, and they are useful for quantum communication network with atomic-ensemble memories.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Pp, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Hk

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum entanglement plays an important role in quantum communication, such as quantum teleportation [1], quantum dense coding [2, 3], quantum key distribution (QKD) [4–7], quantum secret sharing and quantum state sharing [8–11], quantum secure direct communication [12, 13], and so on. Quantum teleportation [1] requires a maximally entangled photon pair to set up the quantum channel for teleporting an unknown single-particle quantum state without moving the particle itself. Some quantum communication protocols work with maximally entangled quantum systems [5–13]. The high capacity of quantum dense coding [2, 3] comes from the maximal entanglement of quantum systems. Moreover, people should resort to quantum repeaters for a long-distance quantum communication network as the quantum signals can only be transmitted not more than several hundreds kilometers with current technology.

In a quantum repeater [14], a long-distance entanglement channel is divided into many sufficiently short segments and entanglement is required to connect each two neighboring nodes. A long-distance channel can be achieved by performing entanglement swapping for all the quantum systems in the middle memory nodes if they are in maximally entangled states. However, an entangled photon pair is usually produced locally and it suffers inevitably from the environment noise (for instance, the thermal fluctuation, vibration, imperfection of an optical fiber, and birefringence effects) in its distribution process between two memory nodes in quantum communication network, which will degrade its entanglement or even make it in a mixed state. Moreover, the conversion between the stationary memory qubits for storage or manipulation and the flying photonic qubits for transport is required [15]. Both the decoherence of the memory qubits and the non-unity conversion will degrade the entanglement shared by the parties. Entanglement distillation is required to depress the noise effect on entangled systems shared by the parties in the neighboring nodes in a quantum repeater protocol for a long-distance quantum communication network, with which some high-fidelity nonlocal entangled quantum systems can be obtained from a set of less-entangled systems with the help of local operations and classical communications. It includes entanglement purification and entanglement concentration.

Entanglement purification is used to obtain a subset of high-fidelity nonlocal entangled quantum systems from a set of those in a mixed state with less entanglement [16–26]. In 1996, Bennett *et al.* [16] proposed the first entanglement purification protocol (EPP) to purify a particular Werner state, resorting to quantum controlled-not (CNOT) gates. Subsequently, Deutsch *et al.* [17] optimized this EPP with two additional specific unitary operations. In 2001, Pan *et al.* [18] introduced an EPP with linear optical elements and an ideal entanglement source, which successes in a heralded way by keeping the cases that the two photons owned by the same party have the identical polarization.

* *fgdeng@bnu.edu.cn

In 2002, Simon and Pan [19] developed an EPP with linear optical elements and a currently available parametric down-conversion (PDC) source. In 2008, an efficient EPP [20] based on a PDC source was proposed with cross-Kerr nonlinearity. It has the same efficiency as that implemented with CNOT gates [16]. In 2011, multipartite EPP (MEPP) [21] with entanglement link from subspaces is presented with cross-Kerr nonlinearity. In 2013, Ren *et al.* [22] proposed an EPP for spatial-polarization hyperentangled photon systems, assisted by diamond nitrogen-vacancy centers inside photonic crystal cavities. Recently, some deterministic EPPs [23–26] were proposed. They can be used to distill a quantum system in a maximally entangled state from each system transmitted if one or two degrees of freedom of the photon system are immune to channel noise.

Entanglement concentration is used to get some nonlocal maximally entangled systems from a set of systems in a partially entangled pure state. In 1996, Bennett *et al.* [27] presented the first entanglement concentration protocol (ECP) for two-particle systems, resorting to the Schmidt projection method and collective measurements. In 1999, Bose *et al.* [28] proposed another ECP based on entanglement swapping. Subsequently, Shi *et al.* [29] presented a different ECP based on entanglement swapping and a collective unitary evolution. In 2001, Zhao *et al.* [30] and Yamamoto *et al.* [31] proposed two similar ECPs independently with linear optical elements. In 2008, Sheng *et al.* [32] developed an ECP with cross-Kerr nonlinearity, and its efficiency is improved largely by iteration of the entanglement concentration process. In 2012, Sheng *et al.* [33] and Deng [34] proposed two single-photon-assisted ECPs independently with linear optical elements. In 2013, Ren *et al.* [35] presented an ECP for hyperentangled photon pairs with the parameter-splitting method [35], and one can obtain a pair of maximally hyperentangled photons from a pair of partially hyperentangled ones and no ancillary qubit is involved. Some ECPs for quantum-dot systems [36, 37] and atom systems [38–41] were proposed.

The atomic ensemble system is one of the most promising candidates for quantum communication [42], due to the collective enhancement effect originated from the indistinguishability of the atoms when interacting with radiations. Moreover, it has a long coherence time and is a perfect memory nodes for long-distance quantum communication network. For example, in a seminal paper by Duan *et al.* [43], the atomic ensemble is utilized to be a local memory node [15] for long-distance quantum communication. Inspired by the repeater protocol in [43], there are plenty of works for long-distance quantum communication based on atomic ensembles [42]. In 2007, the fault-tolerant quantum repeater with atomic ensembles and linear optics was developed [44]. In 2010, Zhao *et al.* [45] proposed a quantum repeater protocol for the atomic ensembles by utilizing the Rydberg blockade effect [46]. In 2011, Aghamalyan *et al.* [47] proposed a high-efficiency quantum repeater protocol based on the deterministic storage of a single photon in an atomic ensemble with the cavity-assisted interaction.

Since the encoding methods are different in these quantum repeater schemes, the EPPs are also different. In the fault-tolerant quantum repeater [44], two atomic ensembles that associate with the photons in different polarizations are used to act as an effective node. The entanglement purification for the nonlocal atomic ensembles can be performed with the EPP developed for polarizing photons [18] when the quantum memories are involved [15]. In [45], two different single collective spin-wave excitation states of the atomic ensemble are used to encode a stationary qubit. The entanglement purification for the atomic ensembles in two different nodes is completed with the scheme proposed in [16], since the CNOT gate between the two atomic ensembles in each node is available, when they are placed within the blockade radius [46].

In this paper, we investigate the possibility of achieving the entanglement distillation for nonlocal atomic ensembles by the input-output process of a single photon from a single-side atomic cavity as a result of cavity quantum electrodynamics (QED). We give three efficient entanglement distillation protocols (EDPs) for nonlocal two-atomic-ensemble systems, including an optimal ECP for a partially entangled pure state with known parameters, an efficient ECP for an unknown partially entangled pure state with a nondestructive parity-check detectors (PCD) which works efficiently in a simple way, and an EPP for a mixed entangled state. Compared with the EDPs for atom systems by others [38–41], our EDPs for nonlocal atomic ensembles have the advantage of high fidelity and efficiency with current experimental techniques. Moreover, it is easier to implement our EDPs than the former, and they are useful for quantum communication network with atomic ensembles acting as memories.

II. NONDESTRUCTIVE PARITY-CHECK DETECTOR ON TWO LOCAL ATOMIC ENSEMBLES

A. An atomic-ensemble-cavity system

Let us consider an ensemble composed of N cold atoms trapped in a single-side optical cavity [47, 48], shown in Fig.1(a). The atom has a four-level internal state, shown in Fig. 1(b). The two hyperfine ground states of a cold atom are denoted with $|g\rangle$ and $|s\rangle$. The excited state $|e\rangle$ and the Rydberg state $|r\rangle$ are two auxiliary states. The atomic transition between $|s\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ is resonantly coupled to the polarized cavity mode a , which is nearly resonantly driven by the input photon in the polarization $|h\rangle$ with the frequency ω , while the transition between $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$




FIG. 1: (a) Schematic diagram for a single-side cavity coupled to an atomic ensemble system composed of N cold atoms. (b) Schematic diagram for the level structure of a cold atom.

is a dipole-forbidden one [49]. Initially, the atomic ensemble is prepared in the ground state $|G\rangle = |g_1, \dots, g_N\rangle$. An arbitrary unitary operation between the ground state $|G\rangle$ and the single collective spin-wave excitation state $|S\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j |g_1, \dots, s_j, \dots, g_N\rangle$ can be performed efficiently with the Rydberg blockade effect of the state $|r\rangle$ by the collective laser manipulations on the ensemble [46, 50, 51].

In the frame rotating with the cavity frequency ω_c , the Hamiltonian of the whole system composed of an input photon and an atom ensemble inside a single-side cavity can be expressed as ($\hbar = 1$) [49, 52]

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\left(\Delta - i \frac{\gamma_{e_j}}{2} \right) \sigma_{e_j e_j} + i g_j (a \sigma_{e_j s_j} - a^\dagger \sigma_{s_j e_j}) \right] + \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2\pi}} \int d\delta' [b^\dagger(\delta') a - b(\delta') a^\dagger] + \int d\delta' b^\dagger(\delta') b(\delta'). \quad (1)$$

Here a and b are the respective annihilation operators of the $|h\rangle$ polarized cavity mode and the input photon mode with $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$ and $[b(\delta'), b^\dagger(\delta'')] = \delta(\delta' - \delta'')$. $\Delta = \omega_0 - \omega_c$ is the detuning between the cavity mode frequency ω_c and the dipole transition frequency ω_0 . $\delta' = \omega - \omega_c$, $\sigma_{e_j e_j} = |e_j\rangle\langle e_j|$, and $\sigma_{e_j s_j} = |e_j\rangle\langle s_j|$. The coupling rate $\sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2\pi}}$ between the cavity and the input photon is taken to be a real constant [49, 52], since only the fields with the carrier frequency close to ω_c contribute mostly to the cavity mode. The coefficients γ_{e_j} and g_j denote the spontaneous emission rate of the excited state $|e_j\rangle$ and the coupling rate between the j -th atom and the cavity mode a , respectively. For simplicity, we assume $g_j = g$ and $\gamma_{e_j} = \gamma$ below.

Initially, when the ensemble is prepared in the state $|S\rangle$, the input photon is in the state $|h\rangle$, and the cavity mode is vacuum, with the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1), the evolution of the whole system can be confined in the first-order excitation subspace with a general state $|\Psi(t)\rangle$. Here

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \alpha(t)|S\rangle \otimes |1, 0\rangle + \int d\delta' \beta^{\delta'}(t) |S\rangle \otimes |0, 1\rangle + \zeta|E\rangle \otimes |0, 0\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $|E\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j |g_1, \dots, e_j, \dots, g_N\rangle$. $|m, n\rangle$ represents the Fock state with the photon numbers m (0 or 1) and n (0 or 1) in the cavity mode and the free space mode, respectively. The Schrödinger equations for this system can be specified to be:

$$i\dot{\alpha}(t) = -ig\zeta(t) - i\sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2\pi}} \int d\delta' \beta^{\delta'}(t), \quad (3)$$

$$i\dot{\beta}^{\delta'}(t) = i\sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2\pi}} \alpha(t) + \delta' \beta^{\delta'}(t), \quad (4)$$

$$i\dot{\zeta}_j(t) = (\Delta - i\frac{\gamma}{2})\zeta_j(t) + ig\alpha(t). \quad (5)$$

In the condition $t_0 < t < t_1$ (here t_0 and t_1 are the time when the photon inputs and outputs the cavity, respectively), one can get the standard input-output relations from Eq.(4),

$$\beta^{out}(t) = \beta^{in}(t) + \sqrt{\kappa} \alpha(t), \quad (6)$$

where

$$\beta^{in}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int e^{-i\delta'(t-t_0)} \beta_{(t_0)}^{\delta'}(\delta') d\delta', \quad \beta^{out}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int e^{-i\delta'(t-t_1)} \beta_{(t_1)}^{\delta'}(\delta') d\delta'. \quad (7)$$

Here $\beta_{(t_0)}^{\delta'}(\delta')$ and $\beta_{(t_1)}^{\delta'}(\delta')$ are the probability amplitudes of the input photon with the frequency $\omega = \omega_c + \delta'$ at the time t_0 and t_1 , respectively. Taking Eqs. (3) and (5) into account, one can get the reflection coefficient $r_{(\delta')} = \beta_{(t_1)}^{\delta'}/\beta_{(t_0)}^{\delta'}$ of the cavity, that is,

$$r(\delta') = \frac{(\delta' - i\kappa/2)(\Delta + i\gamma/2) - g^2}{(\delta' + i\kappa/2)(\Delta + i\gamma/2) - g^2}. \quad (8)$$

If the ensemble is initially in the state $|G\rangle$, it will be decoupled to the cavity mode, and the input photon in the polarization $|h\rangle$ will be reflected by an empty cavity [52]. The reflection coefficient $r_0(\delta')$ is

$$r_0(\delta') = \frac{\delta' - i\kappa/2}{\delta' + i\kappa/2}. \quad (9)$$

Note that when the detuning $|\delta'| \ll \kappa$ and $\gamma\kappa/4 \ll g^2$, one can get a unitary reflection with $r_0(\delta') \simeq -1$ and $r(\delta') \simeq 1$, respectively, which can be summarized to a reflection operator $\hat{R} = |h\rangle\langle h|(-|G\rangle\langle G| + |S\rangle\langle S|)$ when the input-output process is involved.

B. PCD on two local atomic ensembles with the input-output process of a single photon




FIG. 2: Schematic diagram for a PCD on two ensembles E_{A_1} and E_{A_2} . a_{in} is the input port of the photon. HWP_i ($i = 1, 2$) represents a half-wave plate whose optical axis is set to $\pi/4$ to perform the bit-flip operation $\sigma_x = |h\rangle\langle v| + |v\rangle\langle h|$ on the photon. H represents a half-wave plate whose optical axis is set to $\pi/8$ and completes the Hadamard transformation. PBS is a polarizing beam splitter, which transmits the $|H\rangle$ polarization photon and reflects the $|V\rangle$ polarization photon, respectively.

The principle of our nondestructive parity-check detector (PCD) on two local atomic ensembles, say $E_{A_1}E_{A_2}$, is shown in Fig.2. Suppose these two atomic ensembles $E_{A_1}E_{A_2}$ are in the state $|\varphi\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{A_2}} = \alpha_1|GG\rangle + \alpha_2|GS\rangle + \alpha_3|SG\rangle + \alpha_4|SS\rangle$. A probe photon a in the polarization state $|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|h\rangle + |v\rangle)$ sent into the port a_{in} is split into two components $|h\rangle$ and $|v\rangle$ by the polarizing beam splitter PBS_1 and then is led into the two cavities which contain the ensemble E_{A_1} and the ensemble E_{A_2} , respectively. The state of the system composed of the photon a and the ensembles $E_{A_1}E_{A_2}$ evolves as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi\rangle_{PE_{A_1}E_{A_2}} &= |\phi\rangle|\varphi\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{A_2}} \xrightarrow{PBS_1} \sigma_x^{A_1}|\varphi\rangle_{PE_{A_1}E_{A_2}} \xrightarrow{\hat{R}} \hat{R}_{A_2}\hat{R}_{A_1}\sigma_x^{A_1}|\varphi\rangle_{PE_{A_1}E_{A_2}} \\ &\xrightarrow{HWP_2} \sigma_x^{A_2}\hat{R}_{A_2}\hat{R}_{A_1}\sigma_x^{A_1}|\varphi\rangle_{PE_{A_1}E_{A_2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here $\sigma_x^i = |h\rangle\langle v| + |v\rangle\langle h|$ stands for the bit-flip operator on the photon sent to the ensemble i ($i = A_1$ or A_2). $\hat{R}_i = |h\rangle_i\langle h|(-|G\rangle\langle G| + |S\rangle\langle S|)_i$ is the reflection operator on the ensemble i and the photon sent to it. Subsequently, the photon a is subjected to a Hadamard transformation H_p [$|h\rangle \leftrightarrow 1/\sqrt{2}(|h\rangle + |v\rangle)$ and $|v\rangle \leftrightarrow 1/\sqrt{2}(|h\rangle - |v\rangle)$] denoted by H in Fig. 2, and the state of the whole system evolves into

$$|\varphi\rangle'_{PE_{A_1}E_{A_2}} = |h\rangle_p(\alpha_1|GG\rangle - \alpha_4|SS\rangle)_{A_1A_2} + |v\rangle_p(\alpha_2|GS\rangle - \alpha_3|SG\rangle)_{A_1A_2}. \quad (11)$$

When an $|h\rangle$ photon is detected, the two-ensemble system $E_{A_1}E_{A_2}$ is the even-parity state $|\varphi\rangle_e = \frac{1}{|\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_4|^2}(\alpha_1|GG\rangle - \alpha_4|SS\rangle)_{A_1A_2}$. In contrast, if a $|v\rangle$ photon is detected, $E_{A_1}E_{A_2}$ is in the odd-parity state $|\varphi\rangle_o = \frac{1}{|\alpha_2|^2 + |\alpha_3|^2}(\alpha_2|GS\rangle - \alpha_3|SG\rangle)_{A_1A_2}$. That is, the quantum circuit shown in Fig.2 can be used to accomplish a parity-check gate on the two atomic ensembles $E_{A_1}E_{A_2}$. Moreover, this parity-check gate is quite simple and only one efficient input-output process is involved. It can be performed efficiently with a high fidelity since the cavities show a unity reflectance.

III. ENTANGLEMENT CONCENTRATION FOR PARTIALLY ENTANGLED ATOMIC ENSEMBLES

A. Optimal ECP for two nonlocal atomic ensembles in a known partially entangled state

The principle of our optimal ECP (OECP) for a pair of nonlocal partially entangled atomic ensembles $E_A E_B$ is shown in Fig. 3. E_A and E_B belong to two parties in two nonlocal memory nodes in a quantum communication network, say Alice and Bob, respectively. This ECP is used to distill probabilistically a nonlocal two-ensemble system in a maximally entangled Bell state from that in a partially entangled pure state with known parameters.




FIG. 3: Schematic diagram of our optimal ECP for a nonlocal two-atomic-ensemble system in a partially entangled state with known parameters. Alice and Bob are two parties in two nonlocal memory nodes in a quantum communication network. E_A and E_B are the two nonlocal atomic ensembles which belong to Alice and Bob, respectively. The UBS is an unbalanced beam splitter with the reflection coefficient $R = \alpha/\beta$.

Suppose the two-atomic-ensemble system $E_A E_B$ is initially in the following partially entangled pure state [28, 29, 33, 34, 37]

$$|\phi\rangle_{E_A E_B} = \alpha|GS\rangle_{AB} + \beta|SG\rangle_{AB}, \quad (12)$$

where the known real coefficients α and β satisfy $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ and $|\alpha| < |\beta|$ (the case of $|\alpha| > |\beta|$ can be treated in the same way). In order to complete this optimal ECP, Bob prepares a single photon b in the state $|\phi\rangle_b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|h\rangle + |v\rangle)$ and leads it to the port b_{in} , shown in Fig. 3.

After PBS_1 , the photon b will be reflected by the cavity or the mirror M , and a reflect operator $\hat{R} = |h\rangle\langle h|(-|G\rangle\langle G| + |S\rangle\langle S|)$ is introduced. Subsequently, Bob performs a Hadamard operation on the photon b with the half-wave plate H_1 . The state of the composite system composed of the photon b and the ensembles $E_A E_B$ evolves into $|\phi\rangle_{ABb}$,

$$|\phi\rangle_{ABb} = \alpha|GS\rangle_{AB}|h\rangle_b - \beta|SG\rangle_{AB}|v\rangle_b. \quad (13)$$

PBS_2 , PBS_3 , and the unbalanced beam splitter (UBS) on the vertical path of the photon b with the reflection coefficient $R = \alpha/\beta$ will change $|\phi\rangle_{ABb}$ into

$$|\phi'\rangle_{ABb} = \alpha(|GS\rangle_{AB}|h\rangle_b - |SG\rangle_{AB}|v\rangle_b) - \sqrt{\beta^2 - \alpha^2}|SG\rangle_{AB}|v_e\rangle_b. \quad (14)$$

The system is in the state $|SG\rangle_{AB}|v_e\rangle_b$ with the probability $p_e = \beta^2 - \alpha^2$, which leads to an error can be heralded by a click of the detector D'_v . If the detector D'_v does not click, the photon b and the ensembles $E_A E_B$ will be projected into the hybrid maximally entangled GHZ state $|\phi''\rangle_{ABb} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GS\rangle_{AB}|h\rangle_b - |SG\rangle_{AB}|v\rangle_b)$, which takes place with the probability $2|\alpha|^2$.

To complete the optimal ECP for the entangled ensembles $E_A E_B$, Bob performs another Hadamard operation on the photon b with H_2 , and the state of the system becomes

$$|\phi''\rangle_{ABb} \rightarrow |\phi'''\rangle_{ABb} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|h\rangle_b \otimes |\psi^-\rangle_{E_A E_B} + |v\rangle_b \otimes |\psi^+\rangle_{E_A E_B}), \quad (15)$$

where $|\psi^\pm\rangle_{E_A E_B} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GG\rangle \pm |SS\rangle)_{AB}$. If the detector D_v clicks, this optimal ECP is completed successfully, and Alice and Bob share a nonlocal two-atomic-ensemble system in a maximally entangled Bell state $|\psi^+\rangle_{E_A E_B}$. It is also completed successfully by the response of the detector D_h , followed by a phase-flip operation $\sigma_z = |G\rangle\langle G| - |S\rangle\langle S|$.

on the ensemble E_B . In other words, Bob can judge whether this ECP succeeds or not, according to the response of the detectors. The success probability of our optimal ECP is $\eta_c^i = 1 - p_e = 2|\alpha|^2$ which is just the maximal value in nonlocal entanglement concentration.

Nevertheless, our nonlocal optimal ECP can be generalized to distill maximally entangled N -ensemble GHZ states from a partially entangled GHZ-class pure state. Let us, for example, consider the case that Alice (E_A), Bob (E_B), $\dots$, and Charlie (E_C) share a partially entangled N -ensemble state

$$|\phi\rangle_{E_A E_B \dots E_C} = \alpha |GG \dots G\rangle_{AB \dots C} + \beta |SS \dots S\rangle_{AB \dots C}, \quad (16)$$

with $|\alpha| < |\beta|$ and $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. Through a similar process to that for the two-ensemble case, the parties can entangle a polarization photon with the N -ensemble system. A local filtering operation on the $|v\rangle$ component of the photon followed by a single-photon detection will project the remaining N -ensemble system $E_A E_B \dots E_C$ into the maximally entangled GHZ state

$$|\phi'\rangle_{E_A E_B \dots E_C} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GG \dots G\rangle_{AB \dots C} + |SS \dots S\rangle_{AB \dots C}) \quad (17)$$

with a probability $P'_{mc} = 2|\alpha|^2$.




FIG. 4: Schematic diagram of our ECP for a nonlocal two-atomic-ensemble system in a partially entangled state with unknown parameters, achieved by the input-output process of a single photon. Bob completes the parity-check measurement on ensembles E_{B1} and E_{B2} with a PCD, assisted by a single photon.

B. ECP for atomic ensembles in a partially entangled state with unknown parameters

The principle of our ECP for nonlocal atomic ensembles in a partially entangled pure state with unknown parameters is shown in Fig. 4. The two atomic ensembles E_{A1} and E_{A2} belong to Alice, and the two atomic ensembles E_{B1} and E_{B2} belong to Bob. Suppose these two identical pairs of partially entangled ensembles $E_{A1}E_{B1}$ and $E_{A2}E_{B2}$ are in the states

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi\rangle_{E_{A1}E_{B1}} &= \alpha |GS\rangle_{A1B1} + \beta |SG\rangle_{A1B1}, \\ |\varphi\rangle_{E_{A2}E_{B2}} &= \alpha |GS\rangle_{A2B2} + \beta |SG\rangle_{A2B2}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the coefficients α and β are unknown and $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. The essential process of the ECP is projecting the state of $E_{B1}E_{B2}$ into the odd-parity subspace other than the even-parity subspace after a bit-flip operation on one of the photons in the ECPs [30, 31], and it succeeds in a heralded way when the photon detector D_v clicks. The parties, Alice and Bob, can distill a maximal entangled two-ensemble system even in the case that a practical input-output process is involved, since the even-parity state of $E_{B1}E_{B2}$ will never lead to the click of D_v .

To perform the PCD on $E_{B1}E_{B2}$, Bob prepares a single photon b in the state $|\varphi\rangle_b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|h\rangle + |v\rangle)_b$ and leads it to the port b_{in} , shown in Fig. 4. The photon b passes through PBS_1 and HWP_1 , and then it is reflected by the two cavities kept by Bob. After the photon passes through HWP_2 and PBS_1 again, it will entangle with the four atomic ensembles. That is, Bob performs a parity-check measurement on his two atomic ensembles $E_{B1}E_{B2}$. When an odd-parity outcome is obtained, the state of the four-atomic-ensemble system $E_{A1}E_{B1}E_{A2}E_{B2}$ is projected into a maximally entangled four-particle GHZ state $|\Phi\rangle_{E_{A1}E_{B1}E_{A2}E_{B2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GSSG\rangle - |SGGS\rangle)_{A1B1A2B2}$, which takes

place with the probability $2|\alpha\beta|^2$. By taking a Hadamard operation $H_E [|G\rangle \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|G\rangle + |S\rangle), |S\rangle \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|G\rangle - |S\rangle)]$ on both the ensembles E_{A_2} and E_{B_2} , Alice and Bob evolve the four-atomic-ensemble system into

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi'\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}E_{A_2}E_{B_2}} &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} [(|GS\rangle - |SG\rangle)_{A_1B_1} (|GG\rangle - |SS\rangle)_{A_2B_2} \\ &\quad + (|GS\rangle + |SG\rangle)_{A_1B_1} (|GS\rangle - |SG\rangle)_{A_2B_2}]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Alice and Bob can obtain a nonlocal two-atomic-ensemble system $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}$ in a maximally entangled Bell state by measuring the two ensembles E_{A_2} and E_{B_2} independently with the basis $\{|G\rangle, |S\rangle\}$. In detail, if Alice and Bob obtain two different outcomes $(|G\rangle_{A_2}|S\rangle_{B_2})$ or $(|S\rangle_{A_2}|G\rangle_{B_2})$, the remaining ensembles $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}$ will be projected into $|\psi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$. If Alice and Bob obtain the same outcomes $|G\rangle_{A_2}|G\rangle_{B_2}$ or $|S\rangle_{A_2}|S\rangle_{B_2}$, the two-atomic-ensemble system $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}$ is projected into the state $|\psi^-\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$ which can be transformed to the state $|\psi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$ with a phase-flip operation $\sigma_z = |G\rangle\langle G| - |S\rangle\langle S|$ on the ensemble E_{A_1} or E_{B_1} .

In our ECP above, Alice and Bob only pick up the instances in which Bob obtains an odd-parity outcome and discard the case that an even-parity outcome is obtained. The two-atomic-ensemble system $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}$ in the maximally entangled Bell state $|\psi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$ is obtained with the probability $\eta_{c'}^i = 2|\alpha\beta|^2$. In fact, the systems in the instances in which D_h is fired are projected into the partially entangled pure state $|\xi\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}E_{A_2}E_{B_2}} = \frac{1}{|\alpha|^4+|\beta|^4}(\alpha^2|GSGS\rangle + \beta^2|SGSG\rangle)_{A_1B_1A_2B_2}$ and they are useful for distilling a subset of two-atomic-ensemble systems $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}$ in the maximally entangled Bell state $|\phi\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$ as $|\xi\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}E_{A_2}E_{B_2}}$ has the similar form to that of the state $|\varphi\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$. Alice and Bob can measure the ensembles E_{A_2} and E_{B_2} with the basis $\{|G\rangle, |S\rangle\}$ after a Hadamard operation on both the two ensembles E_{A_2} and E_{B_2} , and they will obtain the two-atomic-ensemble systems $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}$ in the state $|\varphi'\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}} = \frac{1}{|\alpha|^4+|\beta|^4}(\alpha^2|GS\rangle + \beta^2|SG\rangle)_{A_1B_1}$ with or without a phase-flip operation σ_z on E_{A_1} . They can perform the ECP in the second round by replacing α and β with $\alpha' \equiv \frac{\alpha^2}{|\alpha|^4+|\beta|^4}$ and $\beta' \equiv \frac{\beta^2}{|\alpha|^4+|\beta|^4}$, respectively. It is not difficult to calculate the success probability of the ECP in the second round $\eta_{c'}^{ii} = \frac{2|\alpha\beta|^4}{(|\alpha|^4+|\beta|^4)^2}$. After two rounds of entanglement concentration, the total success probability is $\eta_{c'}^i = \eta_{c'}^{ii} + \eta_{c'}^{ii}$. Certainly, the method described above can be cascaded to the n -th round of concentration in the ideal case that the photon loss of the input-output process and the decoherence of the ensembles are tiny and can be ignored, and the total success probability of the ECP can be further improved.

IV. ENTANGLEMENT PURIFICATION FOR ATOMIC ENSEMBLE SYSTEMS WITH PCDS

In general, a quantum system in a maximally entangled Bell state will be degraded into a mixed entangled state in the process of entanglement distribution between two memory nodes and its storage. In this time, the parties should use an EPP to improve the entanglement of the systems shared for creating a high-fidelity quantum channel in a quantum communication network.

Suppose that the two-ensemble systems shared by Alice and Bob are in a mixed entangled state $\rho_{E_A E_B}$,

$$\rho_{E_A E_B} = f_0|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+| + (1-f_0)|\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+|, \quad (20)$$

which can be viewed as a mixture of two pure states $|\psi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GG\rangle + |SS\rangle)_{AB}$ and $|\phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GS\rangle + |SG\rangle)_{AB}$ with the probabilities f_0 and $1-f_0$, respectively. Here, we only discuss the purification of the systems with bit-flip errors $|\phi^+\rangle$, as the same as those for photon systems in [18–21], because the parties can convert the phase-flip error into the bit-flip error with a Hadamard operation H_E on each of the two ensembles E_A and E_B .

The principle of our EPP for two-atomic-ensemble systems with PCDS is shown in Fig.5. Alice and Bob choose two pairs of two-ensemble systems $\rho_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$ and $\rho_{E_{A_2}E_{B_2}}$ in each time for purification. The four-ensemble system $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}E_{A_2}E_{B_2}$ can be viewed as the mixture of four pure states $|\Psi_4\rangle_1 = |\psi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}} \otimes |\psi^+\rangle_{E_{A_2}E_{B_2}}$, $|\Psi_4\rangle_2 = |\phi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}} \otimes |\psi^+\rangle_{E_{A_2}E_{B_2}}$, $|\Psi_4\rangle_3 = |\psi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}} \otimes |\phi^+\rangle_{E_{A_2}E_{B_2}}$, and $|\Psi_4\rangle_4 = |\phi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}} \otimes |\phi^+\rangle_{E_{A_2}E_{B_2}}$ with the probabilities f_0^2 , $f_0(1-f_0)$, $f_0(1-f_0)$, and $(1-f_0)^2$, respectively. Alice prepares a single photon a in the state $|\varphi\rangle_a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|h\rangle + |v\rangle)$ and Bob prepares a single photon b in the state $|\varphi\rangle_b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|h\rangle + |v\rangle)$. They send their photons a and b into the ports a_{in} and b_{in} , respectively. By choosing the outcomes with the same parity, they can improve the fidelity of the entanglement of the atomic ensembles shared. Let us detail the principle of our EPP as follows.

If the four-ensemble system $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}E_{A_2}E_{B_2}$ is in the state $|\Psi_4\rangle_1$, Alice and Bob will obtain the outcomes with the same parity when they measure the parity of their atomic ensembles with our PCDS. If both Alice and Bob obtain an even-parity outcome, the state of the four-ensemble system becomes $|\Psi_4\rangle_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GSGS\rangle + |SGSG\rangle)_{A_1B_1A_2B_2}$. If both




FIG. 5: Schematic diagram of our EPP for atomic ensembles with PCDs.

Alice and Bob obtain an odd-parity outcome, the state of the four-ensemble system becomes $|\Psi_4'\rangle_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GSSG\rangle + |SGGS\rangle)_{A_1B_1A_2B_2}$. These two instances will take place with the same probability $f_0^2/2$. After Alice and Bob measure the states of their ensembles E_{A_2} and E_{B_2} with the basis $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|G\rangle \pm |S\rangle)\}$, the entangled two-ensemble pair $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}$ in the state $|\psi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$ is obtained with or without a single-qubit operation on either of the ensemble E_{A_1} or E_{B_1} .

If the four-ensemble system $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}E_{A_2}E_{B_2}$ is in the state $|\Psi_4\rangle_2$ or $|\Psi_4\rangle_3$, Alice and Bob cannot obtain the outcomes with the same parity. That is, when one obtains an even-parity outcome of the parity-check measurement on his/her two atomic ensembles, the other obtains an odd-parity outcome. Alice and Bob will obtain the states $|\psi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$ and $|\phi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$ with the same probability $f_0(1-f_0)/2$ after they perform the measurement on their ensembles E_{A_2} and E_{B_2} and operate the ensembles E_{A_1} and E_{B_1} with or without a single-qubit operation.

If $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}E_{A_2}E_{B_2}$ are initially in state $|\Psi_4\rangle_4$, Alice and Bob will also obtain the outcomes with the same parity when the PCDs are applied. If the outcomes are all even, the state of the four-ensemble system becomes $|\Psi_4'\rangle_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GGGG\rangle + |SSSS\rangle)_{A_1B_1A_2B_2}$. If the outcomes are all odd, the state of the four-ensemble system becomes $|\Psi_4'\rangle_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|GGSS\rangle + |SSGG\rangle)_{A_1B_1A_2B_2}$. These two instances will take place with the same probability $(1-f_0)^2/2$. After Alice and Bob measure the states of the ensembles E_{A_2} and E_{B_2} with the basis $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|G\rangle \pm |S\rangle)\}$, they project $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}$ in the state $|\phi^+\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_{B_1}}$ with or without a single-qubit operation on either of the ensemble E_{A_1} or E_{B_1} .

By keeping the instances in which Alice and Bob obtain the outcomes with the same parity, the state of the remained ensembles $E_{A_1}E_{B_1}$ will be project into ρ' ,

$$\rho' = \frac{1}{f_0^2 + (1-f_0)^2} [f_0^2 |\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+| + (1-f_0)^2 |\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+|]. \quad (21)$$

The fidelity of the remained atomic ensembles $F_p = \frac{f_0^2}{f_0^2 + (1-f_0)^2} > f_0$ when $f_0 > 1/2$. By iterating our EPP several rounds, the parties can share a subset of atomic ensembles in a nearly maximally entangled state. For instance, if the initial state with the fidelity $f_0 > 0.7$ is used in the EPP, Alice and Bob can obtain a subset of atomic ensembles in the state with the fidelity $F_p > 0.997$ for only two rounds.

V. FIDELITY AND EFFICIENCY OF OUR ENTANGLEMENT DISTILLATION PROTOCOLS

In the previous section, the three efficient EDPs for two-atomic-ensemble systems are proposed using the input-output process of a single photon as a result of cavity QED. With the optimal ECP and the efficient ECP, one can get the target system in the maximally entangled state. The fidelity of the systems after they are purified with our EPP is just the same as that by the original EPP with the CNOT gates when only the bit-flip is involved [16]. However, with the practical reflection coefficients, one can get the reflective operator $\hat{R}(\delta')$ to describe the reflection process of the $|h\rangle$ polarized photon by the cavity,

$$\hat{R}(\delta') = |h\rangle\langle h| \otimes (r_0|G\rangle\langle G| + r|S\rangle\langle S|), \quad (22)$$

where r_0 and r are the reflection coefficients for the $|h\rangle$ photon shown in Eqs. (8) and (9). The case that $r'_0 = -1$ and $r' = 1$ is the ideal input-output relation used in the previous discussion.

For the optimal ECP, only a pair of atomic ensembles in a partially entangled pure state with known coefficients is used, and the success of this protocol is heralded by the case either detectors D_h or D_v clicks. The practical efficiency η_c of the optimal ECP is

$$\eta_c = \frac{1}{4} \times \left(\alpha^2 |r+1|^2 + \frac{\alpha^4}{\beta^2} |r-1|^2 + \beta^2 |r_0+1|^2 + \alpha^2 |r_0-1|^2 \right). \quad (23)$$

Here α and β are the coefficients of the initial state shared by the two parties. To detail the influence of the practical input-output process on the fidelity of the target state obtained with the optimal ECP, we take the case that the detector D_h clicks as an example and get the amended fidelity F_c

$$F_c = \frac{\left| \alpha \left[r(1 + \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) + 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \right] - \beta \left[r_0(1 + \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) + 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \right] \right|^2}{\left| \alpha \left[r(1 + \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) + 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \right] \right|^2 + \left| \beta \left[r_0(1 + \frac{\alpha}{\beta}) + 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \right] \right|^2}. \quad (24)$$

With the modified output process, the fidelity of the efficient ECP with unknown parameters is still maximal and $F_c = 1$ when the two pairs of the partially entangled pure states are identical, since we choose the case that a $|v\rangle$ polarized photon is detected by Bob, and the detector D_v does not click if both of the two ensembles $E_{B_1} E_{B_2}$ are in the same state, e.g., $|GG\rangle$ ($|SS\rangle$). However, the success probability of the ECP depends on the reflection coefficients, and is reduced to be

$$\eta_{c'} = \frac{(|\alpha|^2 - |\alpha|^4)(|r_0 - r|^2)}{2}. \quad (25)$$

In our EPP for nonlocal atomic ensembles $E_{A_1} E_{B_1}$ and $E_{A_2} E_{B_2}$, the coincidental clicks of the detectors D_h (D_v) and D'_h (D'_v) by Bob and Alice, respectively are used to denote the instances which are kept by Alice and Bob, followed by local operations and measurements on the two ensembles $E_{A_2} E_{B_2}$. That is, the success probability in a practical condition becomes

$$\eta_p = f_0^2 c_{00} + f_0(1-f_0)c_{01} + f_0(1-f_0)c_{10} + (1-f_0)^2 c_{11}, \quad (26)$$

where the coefficients $c_{00} = \frac{1}{2}|r_0 r|^2 + \frac{1}{32}[|(r+r_0)^2|^2 + |(r-r_0)^2|^2]$, $c_{11} = \frac{1}{4}[|r_0|^4 + |r|^4] + \frac{1}{32}[|(r+r_0)^2|^2 + |(r-r_0)^2|^2]$, $c_{01} = \frac{1}{8}[|r_0(r+r_0)|^2 + |r(r+r_0)|^2] = c_{10}$. When the detectors D_h and D'_h click, with the practical input-output relationship detailed in Eq. (22), the fidelity of the target system $E_{A_1} E_{B_1}$ is modified to be

$$F_p = \frac{f_0^2 c'_{00} + f_0(1-f_0)c'_{01}}{f_0^2 c'_{00} + f_0(1-f_0)c'_{01} + f_0(1-f_0)c'_{10} + (1-f_0)^2 c'_{11}}. \quad (27)$$

Here the coefficients $c'_{00} = 2|r_0 r| + \frac{1}{4}(r+r_0)^2|^2$, $c'_{11} = |r_0^2 + \frac{1}{4}(r+r_0)^2|^2 + |r^2 + \frac{1}{4}(r+r_0)^2|^2$, $c'_{01} = \frac{|r+r_0|^4}{2}$, and $c'_{10} = |r_0(r+r_0)|^2 + |r(r+r_0)|^2$.




FIG. 6: The fidelities of our EDPs for two-atomic-ensemble systems as the functions of the scaled coupling strength g/κ and the coefficient of the initial state α or the initial fidelity f_0 for our EPP. Here the scaled detuning $\delta'/\kappa = 0.0566$. (a) The fidelity of our optimal ECP F_c . (b) The fidelity of our EPP F_p .

Colombe *et al.* [53] demonstrated the strong atom-field coupling in a recent experiment in which each ^{87}Rb atom in Bose-Einstein condensates is identically and strongly coupled to the cavity mode with a fibre-based cavity [54]. In this experiment, all the atoms are initialized to be the hyperfine Zeeman state $|5S_{1/2}, F=2, m_f=2\rangle$. The dipole transition of ^{87}Rb $|5S_{1/2}, F=2\rangle \mapsto |5P_{3/2}, F'=3\rangle$ is resonantly coupled to the cavity mode with the maximal




FIG. 7: The efficiencies η_c , $\eta_{c'}$, and η_p of our optimal ECP, efficient ECP, and EPP for two-atomic-ensemble systems.

single-atom coupling strength $g_0 = 2\pi \times 215 \text{ MHz}$. Meanwhile, the cavity photon decay rate is $\kappa = 2\pi \times 53 \text{ MHz}$ and the atomic spontaneous emission rate of $|5P_{3/2}, F' = 3\rangle$ is $\gamma = 2\pi \times 3 \text{ MHz}$. The fidelities and the efficiencies of our optimal ECP, efficient ECP and EPP with the parameters in [53] are shown in Figs. 6 and 7, respectively, as functions of the scaled coupling strength g/κ and the coefficient of the initial state α (f_0 for EPP), where the scaled detuning $\delta'/\kappa = 0.0566$.

One can see that the larger the scaled coupling strength g/κ , the smaller the difference between the fidelities (the efficiencies) of our EDPs in a practical condition and those in an ideal condition. For example, when $g/\kappa > 0.4$ and $\alpha > 0.2$, the efficiency $\eta_{c'}$ of our efficient ECP $\eta_{c'} > 0.065$ which is 84.3% of the ideal efficiency of this ECP $\eta_{c'}^i = 2|\alpha\beta|^2$ when $\alpha = 0.2$. When $g/\kappa > 0.8$ and $\alpha > 0.2$ one has $\eta_{c'}/\eta_{c'}^i > 95.6\%$. When $g/\kappa > 0.8$ and $f_0 > 0.7$, one has the fidelity and the efficiency of our EPP $F_p > 0.843$ and $\eta_p > 0.531$ which are 99.7% and 91.6% of those with the ideal input-output process, respectively. Colombe *et al.* [53] demonstrated the strong atom-field coupling with $g/\kappa > 4$, which means the difference is negligible in experiments with current techniques.

VI. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

Atomic ensembles are good quantum information carriers and wonderful memory nodes for long-distance quantum communication network [42, 43, 45, 47] as they have a longer coherence time and the collective enhancement effect originated from the indistinguishability of the atoms provides a stronger coupling for the nonlinear interaction between a photon and an ensemble [15]. Moreover, it is necessary for the parties in the memory nodes in quantum communication network to store their quantum information in atomic ensembles before they improve the fidelity of the entangled quantum systems and then perform their entanglement swapping for creating a long-distance quantum channel. That is, it is desired to investigate the possibility of achieving the effective entanglement distillation for nonlocal atomic ensembles. We have proposed three efficient EDPs for nonlocal atomic ensembles by the input-output process of a single photon from a single-side atomic cavity as a result of cavity QED.

Compared with the previous ECPs for atom systems [38–41], our optimal ECP and efficient ECP for nonlocal atomic ensembles have some advantages. Our optimal ECP for atomic ensembles in a partially entangled pure state with known parameters has the optimal success probability as that of the ECP for two-photon system [35] and it is achieved by the detection of a single photon which interacts with a single-side cavity one time. It can be used to distill the entanglement of each pair of atomic ensembles and it does not require additional atomic ensembles, which relaxes the difficulty of its implementation in experiment largely. Our efficient ECP can be used to distill a subset of atomic ensembles in a maximally entangled state from those in a partially entangled pure state with unknown parameters, resorting to a PCD which is constructed in a simple way and it involves only one effective input-output process of a single photon, not two or more. Moreover, the success of our efficient ECP is heralded by the individual detection of one $|v\rangle$ photon in each node, independent of the scaled coupling rate g/κ which is not suitable for the existing cavity-involved ECPs [36–41]. By iteration of the concentration process, our efficient ECP has the maximal success probability, compared with other ECPs for the quantum systems in a partially entangled pure state with unknown parameters. In a practical application, it has a high efficiency.

Our EPP for nonlocal atomic ensembles in a mixed entangled state is more efficient than that in [44] where the entanglement purification for atomic systems is completed with the EPP for two-photon systems [18] conditioned on the effective quantum memory [15], and the maximal efficiency is no more than $\frac{1}{2}f_0^2(1 - f_0)^2$. In [45], a CNOT gate for the two ensembles in each node is used to perform the EPP and it doubles the efficiency, compared with [44], while the two ensembles are required to be placed so close to each other that the CNOT gate can be performed faithfully. The requirement is not needed when the PCDs are used to perform our EPP and the efficiency of our EPP equals to that in [45] in the ideal case.

In summary, we have investigated the entanglement distillation for two-atomic-ensemble systems in single-side cavities in the first time and we have proposed three efficient entanglement distillation protocols, including an optimal ECP for a partially entangled pure state with known parameters, an efficient ECP for a partially entangled pure unknown state with a PCD which is constructed in a simple way, and an EPP for a mixed entangled state. These EDPs have higher fidelity and efficiency with current experimental techniques, and they are useful for quantum communication network.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 11174039 and 11174040, NECT-11-0031, and the Open Foundation of State Key Laboratory of Networking and Switching Technology (Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications) under Grant No. SKLNST-2013-1-13.

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, “Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895-1899 (1993).
 - [2] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, “Communication via one- and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2881-2884 (1992).
 - [3] X. S. Liu, G. L. Long, D. M. Tong, and F. Li, “General scheme for superdense coding between multiparties,” *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 022304 (2002).
 - [4] N. Gisin, G. G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, “Quantum cryptography,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145-195 (2002).
 - [5] A. K. Ekert, “Quantum cryptography based on Bells theorem,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661-663 (1991).
 - [6] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and N. D. Mermin, “Quantum cryptography without Bell’s theorem,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 557-559 (1992).
 - [7] X. H. Li, F. G. Deng, and H. Y. Zhou, “Efficient quantum key distribution over a collective noise channel,” *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 022321 (2008).
 - [8] M. Hillery, V. Bužek, and A. Berthiaume, “Quantum secret sharing,” *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 1829-1834 (1999).
 - [9] A. Karlsson, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, “Quantum entanglement for secret sharing and secret splitting,” *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 162-168 (1999).
 - [10] L. Xiao, G. L. Long, F. G. Deng, and J. W. Pan, “Efficient multiparty quantum-secret-sharing schemes,” *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 052307 (2004).
 - [11] F. G. Deng, X. H. Li, C. Y. Li, P. Zhou, and H. Y. Zhou, “Multiparty quantum-state sharing of an arbitrary two-particle state with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen pairs,” *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 044301 (2005).
 - [12] G. L. Long and X. S. Liu, “Theoretically efficient high-capacity quantum-key-distribution scheme,” *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 032302 (2002).
 - [13] F. G. Deng, G. L. Long, and X. S. Liu, “Two-step quantum direct communication protocol using the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen pair block,” *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042317 (2003).
 - [14] H. J. Briegel, W. Dr, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, “Improving the security of secure direct communication based on the secret transmitting order of particles,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5932-5935 (1998).
 - [15] A. I. Lvovsky, B. C. Sanders, and W. Tittel, “Optical quantum memory,” *Nature Photonics* **3**, 706-714 (2009).
 - [16] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, “Purification of noisy entanglement and faithful teleportation via noisy channels,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 722-725 (1996).
 - [17] D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, R. Jozsa, C. Macchiavello, S. Popescu, and A. Sanpera, “Quantum privacy amplification and the security of quantum cryptography over noisy channels,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2818-2821 (1996).
 - [18] J. W. Pan, C. Simon, and A. Zeilinger, “Entanglement purification for quantum communication,” *Nature (London)* **410**, 1067-1070 (2001).
 - [19] C. Simon and J. W. Pan, “Polarization entanglement purification using spatial entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 257901 (2002).
 - [20] Y. B. Sheng, F. G. Deng, and H. Y. Zhou, “Efficient polarization-entanglement purification based on parametric down-conversion sources with cross-Kerr nonlinearity,” *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 042308 (2008).
 - [21] F. G. Deng, “Efficient multipartite entanglement purification with the entanglement link from a subspace,” *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 052312 (2011).
 - [22] B. C. Ren and F. G. Deng, “Hyperentanglement purification and concentration assisted by diamond NV centers inside photonic crystal cavities,” *Laser Phys. Lett.* **10**, 115201 (2013).
 - [23] Y. B. Sheng and F. G. Deng, “Deterministic entanglement purification and complete nonlocal Bell-state analysis with hyperentanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 032307 (2010).
 - [24] Y. B. Sheng and F. G. Deng, “One-step deterministic polarization-entanglement purification using spatial entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 044305 (2010).

- [25] X. H. Li, “Deterministic polarization-entanglement purification using spatial entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 044304 (2010).
- [26] F. G. Deng, “One-step error correction for multipartite polarization entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 062316 (2011).
- [27] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, “Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations,” *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2046 (1996).
- [28] S. Bose, V. Vedral, and P. L. Knight, “Purification via entanglement swapping and conserved entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 194-197 (1999).
- [29] B. S. Shi, Y. K. Jiang, and G. C. Guo, “Optimal entanglement purification via entanglement swapping,” *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 054301 (2000).
- [30] Z. Zhao, J.W. Pan, and M. S. Zhan, “Practical scheme for entanglement concentration,” *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 014301 (2001).
- [31] T. Yamamoto, M. Koashi, and N. Imoto, “Concentration and purification scheme for two partially entangled photon pairs,” *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 012304 (2001).
- [32] Y. B. Sheng, F. G. Deng, and H. Y. Zhou, “Nonlocal entanglement concentration scheme for partially entangled multipartite systems with nonlinear optics,” *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 062325 (2008).
- [33] Y. B. Sheng, L. Zhou, S. M. Zhao, and B. Y. Zheng, “Efficient single-photon-assisted entanglement concentration for partially entangled photon pairs,” *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 012307 (2012).
- [34] F. G. Deng, “Optimal nonlocal multipartite entanglement concentration based on projection measurements,” *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 022311 (2012).
- [35] B. C. Ren, F. F. Du, and F. G. Deng, “Hyperentanglement concentration for two-photon four-qubit systems with linear optics,” *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 012302 (2013).
- [36] C. Wang, Y. Zhang, and G. S. Jin, “Entanglement purification and concentration of electron-spin entangled states using quantum-dot spins in optical microcavities,” *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 032307 (2011).
- [37] C. Wang, “Efficient entanglement concentration for partially entangled electrons using a quantum-dot and microcavity coupled system,” *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 012323 (2012).
- [38] M. Yang, Y. Zhao, W. Song, and Z. L. Cao, “Entanglement concentration for unknown atomic entangled states via entanglement swapping,” *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 044302 (2005).
- [39] Z. L. Cao, L. H. Zhang, and M. Yang, “Concentration for unknown atomic entangled states via cavity decay,” *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 014303 (2006).
- [40] Z. H. Peng, J. Zou, X. J. Liu, Y. J. Xiao, and L. M. Kuang, “Atomic and photonic entanglement concentration via photonic Faraday rotation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 034305 (2012).
- [41] C. Cao, C. Wang, L. Y. He, and R. Zhang, “Atomic entanglement purification and concentration using coherent state input-output process in low-Q cavity QED regime,” *Opt. Express* **21**, 4093-4105 (2013).
- [42] N. Sangouard, C. Simon, H. de Riedmatten, and N. Gisin, “Quantum repeaters based on atomic ensembles and linear optics,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 33-80 (2011).
- [43] L. M. Duan, M. D. Lukin, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, “Long-distance quantum communication with atomic ensembles and linear optics,” *Nature (London)* **414**, 413-418 (2001).
- [44] Z. B. Chen, B. Zhao, Y. A. Chen, J. Schmiedmayer, and J. W. Pan, “Fault-tolerant quantum repeater with atomic ensembles and linear optics,” *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 022329 (2007).
- [45] B. Zhao, M. Muller, K. Hammerer, and P. Zoller, “Efficient quantum repeater based on deterministic Rydberg gates,” *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 052329 (2010).
- [46] M. Saffman, T. G. Walker, and K. Molmer, “Quantum information with Rydberg atoms,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 2313-2363 (2010).
- [47] D. Aghamalyan and Y. Malakyan, “Quantum repeaters based on deterministic storage of a single photon in distant atomic ensembles,” *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 042305 (2011).
- [48] H. Ritsch, P. Domokos, F. Brennecke, and T. Esslinger, “Cold atoms in cavity-generated dynamical optical potentials,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 553-601 (2013).
- [49] L. M. Duan and H. J. Kimble, “Scalable photonic quantum computation through cavity-assisted interactions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 127902 (2004).
- [50] E. Brion, L. H. Pedersen, M. Saffman, and K. Molmer, “Error correction in ensemble registers for quantum repeaters and quantum computers,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 110506 (2008).
- [51] E. Brion, F. Carlier, V. M. Akulin, and K. Molmer, “Quantum repeater with Rydberg-blocked atomic ensembles in fiber-coupled cavities,” *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 042324 (2012).
- [52] D.F. Walls and G.J. Milburn, *Quantum Optics* (Springer- Verlag, Berlin, 1994).
- [53] Y. Colombe, T. Steinmetz, G. Dubois, F. Linke, D. Hunger, and J. Reichel, “Strong atom-field coupling for Bose-Einstein condensates in an optical cavity on a chip,” *Nature (London)* **450**, 272-279 (2007).
- [54] D. Hunger, T. Steinmetz, Y. Colombe, C. Deutsch, T. W. Haensch, and J. Reichel, “A fiber Fabry-Perot cavity with high finesse,” *New J. Phys.* **12**, 065038 (2010).